The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decisions

Inquiry opened on 30 September 2014
Site visit made on 3 October 2014

by C J Ball DArch DCons RIBA IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 November 2014

Appeal A: APP/T3725/A/14/2215618
Land east of Wellesbourne Road and north of Wasperton Lane, Barford CV35 8EL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Sharba Homes (OP) Ltd against the decision of Warwick District Council.
- The application Ref W/13/1465, dated 14 October 2013, was refused by notice dated 14 January 2014.
- The development proposed is the erection of 50 dwellings, provision of open space and associated infrastructure.

Appeal B: APP/T3725/A/14/2222805
Wall adjacent Wellesbourne Road, Barford CV35 8EL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Sharba Homes (OP) Ltd against the decision of Warwick District Council.
- The application Ref W/14/0361, dated 13 March 2014, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2014.
- The development proposed is the partial demolition of approximately 86 metres of wall, circa 2 metres high to below line of damaged bricks and the erection of a safety hoarding together with necessary temporary works plus storage of undamaged bricks.

Decision

1. The appeals are dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. The inquiry sat for 4 days from 30 September to 3 October 2014 and I carried out an accompanied site visit on 3 October. I adjourned the inquiry on 3 October after all the witnesses and third party representations had been heard. As agreed, I received closing submissions in writing from the Council on 13 October and from the appellant on 15 October. I closed the inquiry in writing on 16 October.

3. I note that an earlier scheme for 58 dwellings was dismissed on appeal in March 2013 (APP/T3725/A/12/2184225). The Appeal A scheme is intended to address the shortcomings identified by my colleague in that case.

4. The site is in 2 separate parts, lying adjacent to the gardens of the grade ll* listed Barford House and within its former grounds. The Appeal A proposal shows that vehicular access to the northern site would require the formation of an opening in

the high estate wall fronting Wellesbourne Road, which forms part of the western boundary of that site. The later Appeal B proposal envisages a substantial reduction in height of that wall and the erection of a temporary hoarding.

5. At the inquiry the appellant confirmed that, on Appeal A, the intention was to restore/rebuild the remainder of the wall, on either side of the new opening, to its original line and height. That could be ensured by a condition precedent. On Appeal B, the appellant asserted that, because of its condition, the total dismantling of the full height of the wall would be necessary. I have assessed the Appeal B proposal on that basis. I saw that safety fencing had been erected along the length of the wall in question.

6. Just before the inquiry the Council issued a repairs notice under s.48 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (P(LBCA)A) requiring the commencement of repair work necessary for the proper preservation of the wall. Towards the end of the inquiry, having heard the appellant's expert evidence on the condition of the wall, the Council withdrew the repairs notice and issued the notice required under s.54 of that Act in relation to the execution of works urgently necessary for the preservation of the wall.

Agreed matters

7. At the inquiry the parties submitted an agreed statement of common ground. This sets out the application details, describes the site and its context and outlines applicable planning policy. The statement sets out the matters agreed between the parties including the status of policy documents, housing issues, design and layout, affordable housing, some aspects of conservation and a range of design considerations. The statement also outlines matters not agreed by the parties, including interpretation of pre-application advice; the weight to be attached to guidance and emerging policies; the extent of harm to heritage assets and the balance of public benefits; the condition of the estate wall on Wellesbourne Road; and the justification for the required infrastructure contributions.

8. During the inquiry a further statement of common ground between experts was submitted. This relates specifically to the estate wall on Wellesbourne Road and sets out agreement that either repair or rebuild of the wall is acceptable in heritage, conservation and engineering terms; the restoration of the wall as a heritage asset is a sought-after objective; the wall is in need of major works, with 30-50% of the bricks requiring replacement; a specification of works will need to be agreed; the appointment of a conservation architect should be considered; and further consideration should be given to the retention of the upper part of the wall.

Planning Obligation

9. Before the inquiry the appellant submitted a draft unilateral undertaking under s.106 of the Act as a deed of planning obligation. The undertaking was amended and finalised during the inquiry and an executed deed was submitted just before the adjournment. The undertaking commits the appellant, if planning permission is granted, to providing 20 affordable dwellings and to making a range of financial contributions towards the improvement of local infrastructure, subject to compliance with CIL Regulation 122. The Council confirmed that, as drafted, the undertaking would overcome the 2nd reason for refusal. I held a discrete s.106 session towards the end of the inquiry.

Main issues

10. From the evidence given to the inquiry I consider there to be 2 main issues to consider:

    - the effect of the proposals on the significance of Barford House, its setting and the Barford Conservation Area as heritage assets; and
    - whether the proposal would meet the identified housing needs of the area.

Policy background

11. The local development plan includes the saved policies of the Warwick District Local Plan 1996-2011 (LP). The Council refers to LP policies DAP4, DAP8, DAP9 and DAP11 intended to protect the historic environment. They generally reflect the statutory duties under s.66 and s.72 of the P(LBCA)A but, while they are largely consistent with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), they do not allow for the explicit balancing provisions set out therein. I have therefore followed the method of assessment detailed in Section 12 of the Framework. LP policy SC1 requires residential development to provide a range of sizes and types of dwelling, while policy SC14 seeks appropriate contributions towards community facilities. That is consistent with the Framework.

12. At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Council accepts that Barford is a sustainable location where some new development is appropriate.

13. Framework ¶49 confirms that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development but that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites. The Council recognises that, while the situation is improving, it cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year supply across the district. Thus LP policy RAP1, which restricts new development in Barford, is out of date and ¶14 of the Framework is invoked. This means that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole; or specific policies in the Framework, including those relating to designated heritage assets, indicate that development should be restricted.

14. The emerging Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029 (ELP) is shortly to be submitted for examination. Draft ELP policies HE1, HE2 and HE4 are intended to protect heritage assets and are generally consistent with Framework objectives. Policies DS3, DS4, DS11 H1 and H4 set out the approach to residential development, with Barford designated a Growth Village. Policies HS1, HS4, HS6, DM1 and TR3 seek a range of contributions towards infrastructure provision. The Parish Council has prepared a Neighbourhood Plan (NP) which reflects the aims of the ELP. I understand that the formal consultation period is due to end on 17 November, whereupon, subject to revision, it will be submitted to the Council. While the ELP and the NP are both at an early stage in the adoption process, the housing policies are based on up-to-date evidence of housing need so carry some weight.

15. Other material considerations include National Planning Policy Guidance (the Guidance). I have taken note of the Council's policy guidance on Achieving a Mix of Market Housing (AMMH). While this has not been adopted as a supplementary

planning document, it is based on a 2012 Strategic Housing Market Assessment and is intended to guide developers towards compliance with LP policy SC1 and Framework ¶50 and ¶54. I have also taken account of the Conservation Area guidance leaflet for Barford Conservation Area and I have referred to current English Heritage guidance on the treatment of heritage assets.

Reasons

16. The application site is in 2 parts, adjoining Barford House, on land that previously formed part of its grounds. The northern site consists largely of open fields bounded by established trees, with its western boundary on Wellesbourne Road formed by the original estate wall. The southern site is a more overgrown mix of open land, trees and shrubbery. To the east the site adjoins an area of allotments and to the south is enclosed by the estate wall on Wasperton Lane. To the south west, itself built on former Barford House estate land, lies a small 2-storey block of flats. The site as a whole is outside the LP development boundary and, apart from one small area adjacent to the block of flats, is also outside the draft ELP village envelope. However, it is close to the heart of the village, lying behind Church Street. The northern site would provide 28 dwellings, and most of the open space, with 22 dwellings on the southern site. In each case, road access would be provided through a new opening in the wall enclosing the grounds.

The effect of the proposals on the significance of Barford House, its setting and the Barford Conservation area as heritage assets

17. Barford House is a large Regency stuccoed mansion, built in about 1820. It is listed grade ll* for its particular architectural and historic interest, including some literary associations. It is clearly of great significance. This fine house lies in partially enclosed formal gardens, with a focus provided by an open gazebo 'temple', listed grade ll in its own right. The open gazebo, and its associated haha walls, allow views over the adjoining fields from the house and, more extensively, from the gazebo itself.

18. The evidence clearly shows that these fields, while perhaps not parkland in the usual sense, nonetheless formed part of an estate surrounding the house. This land not only served recreational and functional purposes associated with the house, including gardens, farmery, food production and grazing, but also provided enclosed exclusive space and thus the status appropriate to a Regency mansion. I consider that the surrounding estate lands provide a designed secluded setting for the house and that the particular character of the setting contributes strongly to the special interest and significance of Barford House. Furthermore, the significance of the gazebo rests largely on its location on the boundary between garden and grounds. I understand that the surrounding estate land – the appeal site - was in the ownership of the house until 1976, when it was sold off.

19. At an early stage the estate grounds were enclosed by tree belts and the high walls on Wellesbourne Road and Wasperton Lane. Section 1(5)(b) of the P(LBCA)A makes it quite clear that a designated listed building includes 'any object or structure within the curtilage of the building which, although not fixed to the building, forms part of the land and has done so since before 1st July 1948.' That position is not affected by a change in ownership.

20. Although in poor condition in places, and greatly reduced in others, the original estate boundary wall largely survives. The wall is virtually complete and continuous along the Wellesbourne Road frontage of the house and estate, clearly

defining the extent of original ownership. It is interrupted by the narrow, gate-posted entrance to the house. The boundary wall is within the curtilage of the listed house and, in terms of historic ownership and function, formed part of the original landholding. I consider that it is therefore included in the grade ll* designation of the house and is protected by the listing. The boundary wall is a clear public demonstration of the location, enclosure and exclusive status of the house in its grounds, and has high significance as an integral part of Barford House.

21. The Appeal B application proposes the complete demolition of some 86 metres of the wall, that is, virtually the entire frontage between the adjoining dwelling, No.15 Wellesbourne Road, and the gateposts to the former lodge of Barford House. I saw that, in parts, this section of the wall is in very poor condition. The boundary wall is an important heritage asset and the parties agree that extensive repair and/or rebuilding would be necessary to ensure its survival. However, the application proposes no repair or replacement works, with the appellant simply arguing that the wall is so unsafe that it must be demolished.

22. I heard that, apart from some insurance-funded accident repair work, the owner has carried out no real maintenance to the wall since he acquired it in 1976. I consider that timely repair over the past 38 years would have kept the wall in good condition but it has clearly been allowed to deteriorate over that period to the extent that it now requires major repair. I consider this to be evidence of deliberate neglect so, in accordance with Framework ¶130, I take no account of the deteriorated state of the wall in considering Appeal B. As a roadside curtilage structure, the wall is a prominent part of the grade ll* listed Barford House. I give great weight to the conservation of the wall as an important heritage asset and I see no clear and convincing justification for its complete loss through demolition. The action taken by the Council should ensure that the wall is properly repaired.

23. The house and its former grounds lie within the Barford Conservation Area (CA). The CA is characterised primarily by the closely built up core of the village, with a variety of buildings lining the principal thoroughfares. A notable feature of the development of the village is the number of larger houses set in walled grounds adjacent to the core. Most of these grounds have now been built on but much of the boundary walling remains as a defining characteristic of the village. The Barford House boundary wall on Wellesbourne Road is the most complete surviving example of an estate wall within the village and, as such, makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character and appearance of the CA.

24. The former estate grounds result in a green open space within the village, an attractive and significant feature of the CA and one which the CA guidance leaflet indicates should be protected in order to maintain the character of the village. Notwithstanding the loss to development of further original grounds to the west of Wellesbourne Road, Barford House, its gardens and its former grounds have together also been designated in the LP as a locally listed park and garden in recognition of the evolution of the estate as an historic designed entity.

25. Thus the site is in a very sensitive location, subject to 3 layers of protection – as the setting of an important listed building; as a significant part of the CA; and as a park and garden of key local interest.

26. In his 2013 decision my colleague considered that, while the wider estate had significance in its own right, the land surrounding the house, including that with the potential to provide a vista eastwards from the formal garden, and the

Wellesbourne Road frontage, are most sensitive to change and are of particular importance. In the Appeal A proposal, the field immediately to the east of the house would not be developed; this would maintain the openness of this part of the site and, with new orchard and tree planting, would preserve a narrow eastern vista from the house and gazebo.

27. However, the land to the north and south would be intensively developed, with a fairly typical estate layout on the northern site and a more densely built up scheme on the southern site. As a result there would be a loss of open space on both sides of the house and the built-up area of the village would be brought much closer to Barford House, particularly to the south. This would impair the ability of observers to understand and appreciate the importance of Barford House in its wider context. The house, in the open setting of its original grounds, is a designated heritage asset of the highest significance. If the proposed development were to go ahead, the designed secluded setting of the house, and the important contribution this makes to the special interest of this grade ll* listed building, would not be preserved. I consider that such extensive damage to its setting would seriously undermine the distinctive character of Barford House, causing substantial harm to its significance as a very important heritage asset.

28. Road access to both sites would require the breach of the estate wall. In the case of the southern site, the existing wall on Wasperton Lane has long been breached by the construction of a small block of flats at the junction with Wellesbourne Road. The wall is not continuous and, where it does exist, is incomplete. The estate wall on Wasperton Lane is not readily seen in conjunction with Barford House and, since there are intervening buildings, has a less than direct relationship to it. For these reasons, while there would be some loss of original fabric, I consider that the formation of an access here would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the wall as part of the listed house.

29. Access to the northern site would require the formation of a 14 metre wide opening in the wall on Wellesbourne Road, within 50 metres of the entrance to Barford House. The wall here, although in poor condition, is virtually complete and forms a continuous frontage to the road, enclosing the estate grounds. Its purpose is clear and its close relationship to Barford House self-evident. The wall is integral to the architectural and historic value of Barford House. Such a wide opening in the wall in this location would reflect nothing of the characteristic narrow, gated access to the house so that it would be an incongruous feature of the wall. The wide new access would allow extensive views from the public highway into the site, resulting in a severe loss of the sense of seclusion of the former estate grounds and the exclusivity of the setting of Barford House. While the remainder of the wall would be repaired, there would be a substantial loss of original brickwork and the continuous nature of the Wellesbourne Road frontage, and the enclosure it provides, would be lost. The distinctive character of the setting of Barford House would be jeopardised and an important built element of the listed building would not be preserved. I consider that the creation of a new access through the wall at this point would cause substantial harm to the significance of Barford House as an outstanding heritage asset.

30. The green open space of the former estate grounds within the village would be lost. This would be particularly damaging to the unique character of the village. The formation of a wide opening in the wall would destroy the essential continuity of the wall frontage on Wellesbourne Road. This too would damage a feature which makes such a major contribution to the quality of the village townscape.

These works would not preserve the character or appearance of the CA and together would lead to substantial harm to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset. Furthermore, the development of the former estate grounds would result in the loss of the clear historic relationship between house and grounds as a designed entity. The scale of the loss would cause substantial harm to the significance of the locally listed Barford House park and garden as an undesignated heritage asset.

31. Heritage assets are irreplaceable so, in assessing the impact of development, any harm requires a clear and convincing justification. Framework ¶133 confirms that, where a proposed development would lead to substantial harm, as I have found here, consent should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm. In weighing that balance I give considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving the designated heritage assets in accordance with the statutory duty set out in s66 and s72 of the P(LB&CA)A. There is no doubt that providing 50 new dwellings, including 20 affordable units, in an area that cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites would represent a significant public benefit. There would also be economic benefits for the village. However, I give no weight to the claimed benefit of the repair of the remaining part of the boundary wall since the works to form the opening would be so damaging and the requirement for repair arises from deliberate neglect. I give little weight to the benefit of better tree management since virtually all the trees on the site are adequately protected by Tree Preservation Orders and their location within the CA.

32. The cumulative impact of the proposal on a range of heritage assets would be severe. I consider that the public benefits of the proposed development would be nowhere near sufficient to outweigh the substantial harm that would be caused to the significance of Barford House, its setting and the Barford Conservation Area as designated heritage assets.

33. This conclusion is sufficient on its own to justify dismissal of the appeals but I go on to consider the other matters raised.

Whether the proposal would meet the identified housing needs of the area

34. The Council identifies Barford as a sustainable location for some new development and the ELP and the NP both recognise that, in order to meet the district-wide need for housing, Barford should be the location for more housing than would meet the immediate local need. As it cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing, the Council makes no objection in principle to the proposal but argues that the mix of dwellings to be provided would not be consistent with the guidance on Achieving a Mix of Market Housing (AMMH), LP policy SC1 or Framework ¶50.

35. LP policy SC1 states that residential development will not be permitted unless it makes provision for a range of sizes and types of dwelling in all appropriate cases. This sweeping policy is not entirely consistent with Framework ¶50, which requires a much more focussed approach. Framework ¶50 requires local planning authorities to plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community and to identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand.

36. There is no dispute that the 20 affordable homes included in the scheme would meet local requirements. The Council's AMMH is intended to provide the necessary guidance to ensure that development proposals for market homes meet the requirements of Framework ¶50. While AMMH is not adopted policy, it is based on up-to-date evidence and identifies a recommended mix of market homes of 7% 1-bed, 26% 2-bed, 43% 3-bed and 24% 4+bed. This reflects the recent Housing Needs Assessment in Barford which shows that the existing market housing stock is heavily weighted towards larger homes and a consequent need for primarily 2 and 3 bed homes.

37. As the evidence clearly shows, the Council uses AMMH as a starting point for the discussion of the appropriate housing mix on an individual scheme basis. It is not a hard and fast requirement but developers are expected to take it into account in order to ensure that the housing needs of the community are properly met. In this case there appears to have been little constructive discussion and the proposal shows little evidence that the AMMH and local housing need have been considered.

38. The proposed development would provide a majority – 53% - of 4+ bed homes with 43% 3-bed and 4% smaller dwellings. On the face of it that is a range of sizes and types of dwelling, in compliance with policy SC1. However, such provision would exacerbate the preponderance of larger homes in the village and would not adequately meet the local need for smaller dwellings. The mix reflects more the marketing judgement of the developer and, while market trends are important, the extent of the divergence between what is needed and what would be provided is so extreme that it is clear that the proposal would not provide the size, type and range of housing that is required in Barford, reflecting local demand. I find that, in conflict with the objectives of Framework ¶50, the proposal would not meet the identified housing needs of the area.

Financial contributions towards additional local infrastructure

39. LP policy SC14 and ELP policies HS1, HS4, HS6, DM1 and TR3 seek a range of contributions towards the need to provide additional infrastructure, services and facilities arising from new development. CIL Regulation 122 makes it clear that such contributions are only justified if they are necessary to make a proposed development acceptable in planning terms, are directly related to it and are fairly and reasonably related to it in scale and kind.

40. The appellant's undertaking commits the appellant, if planning permission is granted through allowing Appeal A, to providing 20 affordable dwellings as part of the development and to making the required financial contributions towards the improvement of local infrastructure, subject to an express provision (clause 15.2) that if I find any planning obligation to be incompatible with the tests of CIL Regulation 122 and attach no weight to it in determining the appeal, that obligation will cease to have effect.

41. I have some difficulty with this. Although the appellant argues that some of the required contributions are unnecessary and unlawful, I consider that once an executed obligation has been submitted it has legal effect. It does not cease to have legal effect simply by including a clause to that effect in the deed. While it is acceptable to link the obligations to a grant of planning permission, so that if the appeal is dismissed they will not be triggered, that is different from declaring the deed itself to have no effect in certain circumstances. I consider clause 15.2 to be ineffectual, although this does not, in itself, invalidate the obligation.

42. This means that, if the appeal were to be allowed, the appellant would be committed to paying all the contributions regardless of whether or not I consider them compatible with the CIL Regulation 122 tests. In the light of that, and in circumstances where I have already concluded that the appeal should be dismissed for other reasons, so that the undertaking will serve no purpose, I consider it unnecessary to examine in any detail whether any individual obligation is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

Conclusions

43. As the Framework makes clear, the purpose of the planning system is to deliver sustainable development. Sustainable development has 3 dimensions: economic, social and environmental. I have found that the proposed development site is not land of the right type in the right place; that the housing to be provided would not properly meet the needs of present and future generations; and that the proposal would not protect or enhance the natural, built and historic environment. The proposal is therefore comprehensively inconsistent with the economic, social and environmental objectives of sustainable development.

44. The provision of 20 affordable dwellings and 30 new market dwellings would be a significant benefit. However, the adverse impacts of the proposed development on the historic environment in particular would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

45. I find that the proposal would not represent sustainable development. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

Colin Ball

Inspector

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Timothy Leader of Counsel	Instructed by John Gregory, Planning and Litigation Team Leader, Corporate Legal Service, Warwickshire County Council.
He called:	
Rob Young BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI	Senior Planning Officer, Development Management, Warwick District Council.
Sally Jones MRTPI	Planning Officer (Housing), Warwick District Council.
Charles Shapcott CEng MIStructE DipBldgCons(RICS) IHBC	Consulting Conservation Engineer.
Alan Mayes IHBC RIBA	Conservation Officer, Warwick District Council.

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Peter Goatley of Counsel	Instructed by John Jowitt of PJ Planning.
He called:	
Michael Carr BA(Hons) DipLA	Director, Pegasus Planning Group.
Phil Spiers CEng MIStructE	Regional Director, Waterman Structures Ltd.
Richard Morton BA(Hons) MIfA	Principal Heritage Consultant, Cotswold Archaeology.
John Jowitt BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI	Director, PJ Planning.

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Wendy Barlow	Parish Councillor, Sherbourne and Wasperton Joint Parish Council.
Christine Hodgetts BA PhD	Conservation Secretary, Warwickshire Gardens Trust.
John Murphy	Chairman, Barford, Sherbourne and Wasperton Joint Parish Council.
Roger Braithwaite	Local resident.
Rod Scott	Chairman, Barford Residents' Association.
Chris Magson	Local resident.
Alan Roberts	Barford House, Barford.

For the s.106 session

Mel Duffy	Deputy Director of Business Development and Transformation, South Warwickshire NHS Foundation Trust.
Neil Benison BSc IEng MICE	Principal Highway Control Engineer, Warwickshire County Council.
Daniel Robinson BA(Hons) MSc	Planning Officer, Development Policy, Warwick District Council.
Nicholas Corbett BA(Hons) BPL MA MRTPI	Planning Officer, Warwick District Council.

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY

Joint documents

J1 Statement of common ground.
J2 Statement of common ground – expert witnesses.
J3 Inspector's letter closing the inquiry.

For the Council:

C1 Annual returns and key financial details of P A Hopkins Ltd (site owner).
C2 Copy of s.48 repairs notice.
C3 Schedule of infrastructure projects linked to the Southern Growth Area.
C4 Suggested conditions Appeal A.
C5 Suggested conditions Appeal B.
C6 Extract from Chapter V, Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
C7 Copy of s.54 urgent repairs notice.
C8 Post-inquiry closing submissions.

For the appellant:

A1 Extract from the emerging Warwick District Local Plan – Local Plan Policies Map of Barford.
A2 Travelling draft planning obligation.
A3 Housing mix study of Barford by Knight Frank.
A4 Comparison of market housing mix of recently approved schemes and the appeal scheme with the Council's guidance 'Mix of market housing on new development sites (2013)' and associated committee reports.
A5 Barford, Sherbourne and Wasperton Housing Needs Survey December 2013.
A6 Article relating to EH Angel Award for work at Little Mill Lime Kilns, Lonhouton, Northumberland.
A7 Certified copy of executed planning obligation.
A8 Post-inquiry closing submissions.

For the interested persons:

IP1 Draft Barford Neighbourhood Development Plan 2014-2029.
IP2 Dr Hodgetts' statement.
IP3 Mr Murphy's statement.
IP4 Mr Braithwaite's statement.
IP5 Mr Scott's statement
IP6 Mr Magson's statement.
IP7 Mr Roberts' statement.
IP8 Ms Duffy's statement.
IP9 Mr Robinson's email regarding sports and leisure facilities.

If you require an alternative accessible version of this document (for instance in audio, Braille or large print) please contact our Customer Services Department:
Telephone: 0370 333 0607
Fax: 01793 414926
Textphone: 0800 015 0516
E-mail: customers@HistoricEngland.org.uk